

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

The State of California; ex-rel; by and through
SHERWOOD THEODORE: RODRIGUES;
Relator; a living sovereign man resting upon the
soil; and a constantly expanding list of co-
plaintiff John and Jane Does, all suffering
similar Abuses by the same group of Corrupted
Public-Servants and Organized Crime
Racketeering Conspirators,;

Plaintiffs/Accusers,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, W. Scott
McGregor; J. Steven Lapham; Steven Franklyn
Helfand; Robert Joseph Peters; Marcus Daniel
Merchasin; James R. Greiner Acting in their
Personal, Business, and Official Capacities; and
in their Does 1 – 1,000; et al.,

Defendants/Accused.

Case No. MS05-5034FDB

ORDER OF DISMISSAL


Plaintiff Rodrigues, of Petaluma, California, purports to file a felony criminal complaint on behalf of the state of California alleging, among other things, treason, racketeering, extortion, barratry, and obstruction of justice. Rodrigues cites RCW 7.56.020, Quo Warranto for the proposition that he is entitled to file such a cause of action because he “does claim an interest in each

1 and all of these offices.” Rodrigues also submits an 18-page “Memorandum/Article in Support of
2 Common People Directly Prosecuting Quo-Warranto/State-Ex-Rel Criminal Complaints”; a 17-page
3 “Memorandum/Article Explaining an Artificial/DeFacto Over-Lay in the Government of the State of
4 Washington”; a “Libel of Review/Counterclaim in Admiralty” that indicates the cause of action in
5 United States District Court in Sacramento, California; and a document entitled “Sovereignty-
6 Finding of Facts” that concludes that Rodrigues “is natural, free, sovereign and born in Hawaii, a
7 Republic united by and under the Constitution for the United States of America.

8 The documents are unintelligible and no cause of action within the jurisdiction of this Court
9 can be discerned. The documents filed are gibberish and bear no relation to the kind of action that is
10 usually filed as a miscellaneous case in this Court. This cause of action must be dismissed.

11 ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED: This cause of action is DISMISSED.

12 DATED this 10th day of November, 2005.

13
14 
15 FRANKLIN D. BURGESS
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25